Remarks

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Reconsideration of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 14, 15, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard et al. ("Menard") in view of Papadimitriou et al. ("Papadimitriou"). Claims 7, 8, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Maze et al. ("Maze"). Claims 9, 10, 13, 23, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Legall et al. ("Legall"). Claims 11, 12, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Knudson et al. ("Knudson"). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Herz et al. ("Herz"). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Dougherty et al. ("Dougherty"). Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Proehl et al. ("Proehl"). Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Papadimitriou and further in view of Cao et al. ("Cao"). Claims 1 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadimitriou in view of Menard. Claims 2, 3, 6, 16, 17, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadimitriou in view of Menard and

10

further in view of Lauder et al. ("Lauder"). Claims 4 and 18 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadimitriou in view of Menard and

further in view of Lauder and Kusaba et al. ("Kusaba"). Claims 5 and 19 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadimitriou in view of

Menard and further in view of Lauder and Kusaba and further in view of Sorensen.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method for headend-based information

monitoring, delivery, and notification comprising:

registering at a <u>cable television headend</u> a plurality of user requests for
information <u>other than for program content</u>, the user requests being received
from a plurality of Internet-enabled television systems connected to the cable
television headend;

registering at the cable television headend for at least one of the
requests user-specified criteria for delivery of the requested information in
response to a <u>future triggering event</u> that is <u>separate from and in addition to
the request itself or locating the information</u>;

monitoring at the cable television headend one or more information
sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria;

locating the requested information;

automatically delivering the requested information to the requesting
Internet-enabled television system in response to the delivery criteria being
satisfied; and

notifying a user concerning the delivered information using the Internet-
enabled television system.

<u>References Do Not Disclose Registering Requests with a Headend</u>

The claimed invention allows a user to register a search at a <u>cable headend</u>

for information <u>other than for program content</u>. Searching for television shows of

interest (program content) may easily be done locally within a set top box, since a

11

week or two of schedule information is normally stored there. By contrast, monitoring for arbitrary, <u>non-program</u> information, such as "stock prices, ski conditions, weather conditions, flight information, school lunch menus, sporting scores, election results, and the like" (specification at page 37), which may be stored across hundreds or thousands of servers, ties up significantly more resources within an individual set top box. Hence, according to the claimed invention, a cable headend centrally monitors for the requested information, freeing up the limited resources of the set top boxes.

Neither Menard nor Papadimitriou discloses registering requests at a <u>cable</u> <u>headend</u> as claimed. The Examiner equates Menard's "accesTV" with the claimed cable headend. However, Menard merely discloses a video caching server where requested television programs are cached before being delivered to users' PCs. Menard does not even mention the word "headend." While the Examiner is free to give a term its broadest reasonable meaning, it is not reasonable for the Examiner to ignore the meaning of the word as understood by those of skill in the art. The term "cable headend" has a distinct meaning in the cable television art:

> "A control center of a CATV system, where incoming signals are amplified, converted, processed, and combined into a common cable for transmission to customers. The headend usually includes antennas, preamplifiers, frequency converters, demodulators, modulators, processors, and other related equipment." <u>www.atis.org</u>.

> "A cable head-end (or headend) is the facility at a local cable TV office that originates and communicates cable TV services and cable modem services to subscribers. In distributing cable television services, the head-end includes a satellite dish antenna for receiving incoming programming." <u>www.whatis.com</u>.

The applicants used the term "cable headend" according to its ordinary meaning.

In this case, the Examiner has not pointed to any hint or suggestion of a cable <u>headend</u> in Menard and Papadimitriou. Even if he did with another reference, the

12

Examiner has not shown within the references a teaching, suggestion, or motivation for why central requests for non-program content would be registered within a headend. Normally, a headend is used for distributing television programs. A headend is not normally used for the claimed purposes, and the Examiner has not provided a motivation for combining Menard, which shows program content searching outside the context of a "headend," with a reference teaching a headend. Likewise, Papadimitriou does not disclose or suggest a cable headend. Rather, Papadimitriou, like Menard, only discloses a hierarchy of video caching servers.

References Do Not Disclose Requests *Other than for Program Content*

Menard does not disclose user requests for information other than for program content. Indeed, Menard only refers to using the central search server to search for program sources for television programs. Col. 2, line 39 through col. 3, line 33. Likewise, Papadimitriou only discloses caching multimedia programs, such as television programs. Thus, neither reference discloses registering a request for "other than for program content," as claimed.

The Examiner cites to various other references which perform different types of searches. However, there is no motivation to combine other types of searching as discussed in these references with Menard or Papadimitriou. Ordinarily, cable headends are not used for monitoring for non-program content on behalf of cable subscribers. Thus, without some explicit motivation within the references, a prima facie case for obviousness cannot be established.

13

References Do Not Show Delivery Criteria Including Future Triggering Event that is
Separate from and in Addition to the *Request Itself or Locating the Information*

Menard states that "[w]hen a match is found, the search server 4 sends an
alert signal back over the Internet to the address of the requesting PC." Col. 3, lines
26-28. However, this is merely delivery of the notification in response to locating the
information, contrary to the requirements of amended claim 1.

Papadimitriou discloses "automated means for selecting particular multimedia
programs transmitted by the network 10, and for selecting the times at which the user
12 wishes to view the particular programs." Col. 5, lines 6-9. However, this is just a
form of video-on-demand and is contrary to claim 1 in two respects. First, claim 1
refers to information other than program content, as discussed above. Second, the
triggering event is not separate from and in addition to the request itself. In
Papadimitriou, it is the user request that triggers the delivery, not some external
event. How does Papadimitriou "monitor" at the cable television headend one or
more information sources for the triggering event specified in the delivery criteria,
when the triggering event is simply the user request? This makes the term "monitor"
unreasonably broad, such that the claimed combination would not be obvious to one
of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct. Claim 15
has been amended to include similar limitations and is likewise believed to be
patentably distinct for at least the same reason. All other claims depend directly or

14

indirectly from claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By _____
Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999

15